

## Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration

**Program Code** 10003714

**Program Title** Fish and Wildlife Service - Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration

**Department Name** Department of the Interior

**Agency/Bureau Name** United States Fish and Wildlife Service

**Program Type(s)** Regulatory-based Program  
Competitive Grant Program  
Block/Formula Grant

**Assessment Year** 2005

**Assessment Rating** Results Not Demonstrated

Assessment Section Scores	Section	Score
	Program Purpose & Design	100%
	Strategic Planning	11%
	Program Management	82%
	Program Results/Accountability	20%

Program Funding Level (in millions)	FY2007	\$820
	FY2008	\$905
	FY2009	\$889

### Ongoing Program Improvement Plans

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
2006	Develop long-term outcome and annual output performance measures in conjunction with partners.	No action taken	
2006	Develop a process for and ensure regularly scheduled non-biased, independent program evaluations take place.	No action taken	

2006	Revise individual employee performance plans with specific, measurable annual and long-term goals.	No action taken
2006	Revise, when applicable, partner agreements with specific, measurable annual and long-term goals.	No action taken
2006	Develop efficiency measures.	No action taken

**Completed Program Improvement Plans: None**

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
------------	------------------	--------	----------

**Program Performance Measures; None**

**Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)**

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design			
Number	Question	Answer	Score
1.1	<p><b>Is the program purpose clear?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The purpose of the Wildlife Restoration/Sport Fish Restoration program (hereafter referred to as WR/SFR or the Program) is to cooperate with States to restore, conserve and enhance the nation's fish and wildlife resources, with an emphasis on habitat restoration, and to provide for the public benefits from these resources. The WR/SFR program includes eight environmental resource and recreation grant programs. The WR/SFR programs are: Sport Fish Restoration (SFR), Wildlife Restoration (WR), National Coastal Wetlands Conservation (NCWC), Clean Vessel Act (CVA), Sportfishing and Boating Safety Act (BIG), Hunter Education and Safety Program (Sec. 10), Multi-State Conservation Grants (MSC), and Landowner Incentive Program (LIP).</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Program Mission Statement located at <a href="http://federalaid.fws.gov/aboutfa.html">http://federalaid.fws.gov/aboutfa.html</a>; WR/SFR Program descriptions from the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance; Authorizing Legislation: Sport Fish Restoration (16 U.S.C. 777-777m), Wildlife Restoration (16 U.S.C. 669-669k), Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act, Clean Vessel Act, Sportfishing and Boating Safety Act, Hunter Education and Safety Program,</p>	YES	20%

Multi-State Conservation Grants (SFR and WR), Landowner Incentive Program (PL 108-7).  
Options to Improve the Use of Federal Aid Programs' Administrative Funds, GAO,  
September 29, 1999, GAO/T-RCED-99-285

1.2 **Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest, or need?** YES 20%

*Explanation:* The nation's fish and wildlife populations and their habitats are subject to pressures from a human population that has increased 71% from 1955 to 2001. During this same time period, the number of anglers 16 years and older increased at nearly twice this rate to 34 million in 2001 and the number of hunters increased at about half this rate to 13 million in 2001. Recreational boating has also experienced increased participation. There are more than 13 million registered boats in the U.S. Increased fishing and hunting coupled with increased habitat destruction due to development continues to strain fish and wildlife populations. For example, nationwide 53% of all wetlands have been lost, 90% of native prairie is gone, 70% of riparian (streamside) habitat has been lost, and 3.6 million miles of streams have been degraded. In FY2000, the WR/SFR program provided more than 20 percent of State agency funding for protecting fish and wildlife resources. The program's authorizing legislation also provides important protection against hunting and fishing license fee diversions.

*Evidence:* 2001 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-associated Recreation, USFWS Federal Assistance Division, 2002; Status and Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous United States 1986-1997, USFWS; Passing the Buck, Izaak Walton League 1999; USFWS Federal Assistance Division Website 2005, Wildlife Apportionment History and Sport Fish Apportionment History; NPS River and Water Facts; EPA Environmental News; Fish and Wildlife Agency Funding Survey, Wildlife Conservation Fund of America, 2001.

1.3 **Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?** YES 20%

*Explanation:* The WR/SFR program has been the cornerstone of fish and wildlife conservation in the US for well over 50 years. The WR/SFR program legislation directs the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with State fish and wildlife agencies with primary authority for fish and wildlife resources on their conservation efforts with fish and wildlife

resources, boating access, and aquatic and hunter education programs. The State matches the WR/SFR program funding of about \$700 million annually with State revenues for a coordinated, statewide approach. Other entities and programs have similar, complementary goals. Non-government groups, such as Ducks Unlimited, Elk Foundation, Wild Turkey Federation and Nature Conservancy, work with the State through the WR/SFR program on shared goals. The Farm Bill complements the WR/SFR program. The Farm Bill is directed at habitat on private lands whereas the WR/SFR program is directed at a wide-spectrum of fish and wildlife management issues and related public recreational use.

*Evidence:* Belanger, D.O., Managing American Wildlife: a History of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies; Izaak Walton League, 1999, Passing the Buck; Ross, M.R., and D.K. Loomis, 1999, State management of freshwater fisheries resources: Its organizational structure, funding and programmatic emphases, Fisheries 24(7):8-15; B.L. Bohnsack and R.J. Sousa. 2000, Sport Fish Restoration: A conservation funding success story, Fisheries 27(7):54-56. Farm Bill 2002 - Summary of NRCS Conservation Programs, Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA, 2002.

1.4

**Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?**

YES 20%

*Explanation:* The WR/SFR program has stable funding and a user-benefit, user-pay design which fosters effectiveness by allowing each state to establish its own multi-year state-wide goals for sustainable resources and public use that then are aggregated at the national level. The permanent Congressional appropriation supports State agencies to develop responsive conservation and recreation programs and requires dedicated hunting and fishing licence revenues to multiply the effect. One potential flaw is related to the Federal Aid Improvement Act of 2000 (FAIA). The FAIA reduced program administration funding by about 50% while increasing grantee oversight requirements, i.e. State audits cost about \$3.0 million yearly. Beginning in FY2004, the FAIA sets funding for the program's administration based on the preceding fiscal year's allocation plus Consumer Price index increase. These funding limits and additional oversight responsibilities have reduced the ability to effectively accomplish some program functions (e.g., monitoring, tracking accomplishments, and technical support).

*Evidence:* Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act, Permanent Appropriation; Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act, Permanent Appropriation; Pitmann-Robertson Wildlife

Restoration Act, Expenses for Administration; Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act, Expenses for Administration; Actual Costs, OIG Audits of Recipients of US Fish and Wildlife Service; Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Foundation Facts ([www.rmef.org](http://www.rmef.org)).

1.5

**Is the program design effectively targeted so that resources will address the program's purpose directly and will reach intended beneficiaries?**

YES 20%

*Explanation:* The WR/SFR program limits eligibility to agencies within states that are the recognized state lead for fish and wildlife resources. The WR/SFR program funds are used by State fish and wildlife agencies to fund their conservation, recreation and aquatic and hunter education efforts. The WR/SFR program provides an average 20% of total State fish and wildlife agency budgets. The program has awarded \$9.5 billion to State fish and wildlife agencies and, based on 2002 (most recent data available), protects about \$1.2 billion annually in license fee revenue. Through this program, States address their specific needs within parameters of the program intent and guidelines. The result is an enormous beneficial impact on conservation, recreation and education resources. Examples of recovered populations are Atlantic striped bass, elk, pronghorn antelope, white-tailed deer, wild turkey, and red drum.

*Evidence:* Percent of State Fish and Wildlife Budgets; Izaak Walton League 1999, Passing the Buck; USFWS FA Division Website 2005, Wildlife Apportionment History, Sport Fish Apportionment History; License Revenue and Apportionment, Hunting License Revenue, Fishing License Revenue, 2005 WR Apportionment, 2005 SFR Apportionment, To Date as of 2004 WR Apportionment, To Date as of 2004 SFR Apportionment; Tanner, H. 2000, Tragedy to triumph: establishment of the Michigan Great Lakes salmonid fishery, Special Supplement to Fisheries Volume 25, No. 7; Essig, R.J. and R.E. Beal, 2000, Atlantic coast striped bass recovery: Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration in support of interstate fishery management, Special Supplement to Fisheries Volume 25, No. 7; International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, 1997, A guide to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration (Pittman-Robertson) Act; McEachron, L.W. and N.C. Carter 2000, Texas Gulf coast sport fish program, Special Supplement to Fisheries Volume 25, No 7.

**Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design** Score 100%

**Section 2 - Strategic Planning**

Number	Question	Answer	Score
2.1	<p><b>Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The program cooperatively developed/agreed to grants yield annual outputs that have been monitored and tracked since program inception; however, sufficient long-term performance measures for the WR/SFR program have not been adopted, requested, or reported. The Service will facilitate with states a process that leads to updating and modernizing the multi-year goals and targets contained in the 1994 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement so states and the Service can arrive at a limited number of shared measures and targets to guide the program over the next decade. Efforts began in the summer of 2005.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> United States Department of Interior-Fish and Wildlife Service-Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program (1994); Blueprint for FA Strategic Plan.</p>	NO	0%
2.2	<p><b>Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The Federal Assistance Program and State partners, through its grant approval process, agree to a multi-year grant proposal with annual performance objectives, benefits, evaluation, and reporting and requirements; however, sufficient long-term performance measures for the WR/SFR program have not been adopted, requested, or reported. The Service will facilitate with states a process that leads to updating and modernizing the multi-year goals and targets contained in the 1994 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement so states and the Service can arrive at a limited number of shared measures and targets to guide the program over the next decade. Efforts will begin in the summer of 2005.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Application for Federal Assistance, Vermont W-47-R, Moose Investigations; 43 CFR Part 12, Administrative and Audit Requirements and Cost Principles for Assistance Programs; Blueprint for FA Strategic Plan.</p>	NO	0%
2.3	<p><b>Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures</b></p>	NO	0%

	<p><b>that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Annual reports are required by regulation for each of the 3,800+ grants administered annually by the Federal Assistance Division; however, sufficient annual performance measures for the WR/SFR program have not been adopted, requested, or reported. The Service will facilitate with states a process that leads to updating and modernizing the multi-year goals and targets contained in the 1994 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement so states and the Service can arrive at a limited number of shared measures and targets to guide the program over the next decade. Efforts began in the summer of 2005.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Blueprint for FA Strategic Plan; List of Active Grants, FY 2005; Annual Performance Report, Vermont W-47-R-11.</p>		
2.4	<p><b>Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Baseline historical output, process, and workload data for the WR/SFR program was published in annual reports from the inception of these programs 1937 &amp; 1950 until 1991. Since 1991, the output data have been collected, but not summarized and published. Semi-annual Program Update documents are currently published for stakeholders. Sufficient annual performance measures for the WR/SFR program, however, have not been adopted, requested, or reported. The Service will facilitate with states a process that leads to updating and modernizing the multi-year goals and targets contained in the 1994 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement so states and the Service can arrive at a limited number of shared measures and targets to guide the program over the next decade. Efforts began in the summer of 2005.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Federal Aid in Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Programs, Annual Report 1991; Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration, Associated Grant Programs, Program Update March 2005, Blueprint for Federal Assistance Strategic Plan.</p>	NO	0%
2.5	<p><b>Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?</b></p>	NO	0%

*Explanation:* The Fish and Wildlife Service reviews all grant proposals to ensure that they are substantial in character and design, meet the intent of the original WR/SFR legislation and meet the eligibility requirements for the individual programs funded therein. In approving an individual grant for this program, the Service is stating that the grant is contributing to the overall purpose of these programs. In addition, the states must pass laws that prevent the diversion of hunting and license fees to other agencies in order to be eligible to receive funding from this program. Each of the states has passed the necessary laws. Until the Program develops annual and long-term goals the Program will be unable to get credit for this question according to the PART guidance.

*Evidence:* Application for Federal Assistance, Vermont W-47-R-1; 50 CFR Part 80, Sections 80.2 and 80.3.

2.6 NO 0%

**Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?**

*Explanation:* While the program has received significant scrutiny in recent years to ensure that it is meeting its Congressional mandated purposes, there is no evidence that the program conducts non-biased evaluations on a regular basis to fill gaps in performance information. Previous reviews have included Department of Interior Inspector General audits of grant recipients, as well as independent audits and reviews conducted of the Fish and Wildlife Service's administration of the program. Corrective action plans have been implemented with both the States and the Service to correct the program deficiencies as needed. The program was determined to be a "High Risk" program in 2000 and through completion of 46 Action Items, had the "High Risk" moniker removed in 2003. None of these evaluations/reviews have indicated that the program is not meeting its intended purposes.

*Evidence:* Audit Report, Arkansas, Game and Fish Commission, July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2003; Chronology of High Risk Status; The Federal Assistance Program is no Longer a High Risk Program (prepared by Federal Assistance); Department of the Interior, Performance and Accountability Report, 2003.

2.7 NO 0%

**Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and**



	<p><b>transparent manner in the program's budget?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Large components of the WR/SFR program have permanent indefinite appropriation authority and their appropriations are determined by the amount of revenue received into dedicated trust funds and distributed by a legislative formula.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> US Department of the Interior, Budget Justifications and Performance Information, Fiscal Year 2005, Landowner Incentive Program; US Department of the Interior, Budget Justifications and Performance Information, Fiscal Year 2005, Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration; US Dpartment of the Interior, Budget Justifications and Performance Information, Fiscal Year 2005, Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration.</p>		
2.8	<p><b>Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Strategic direction for the WR/SFR program through 2005 was formalized in the 1994 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. The Service will facilitate with states a process that leads to updating and modernizing the multi-year goals and targets contained in the 1994 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement so states and the Service can arrive at a limited number of shared measures and targets to guide the program over the next decade. Sufficient long-term and annual performance measures for the WR/SFR program will be developed at the same time. Efforts began in the summer of 2005.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> United States Department of Interior- Fish and Wildlife Service- Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program (1994). Blueprint for FA Strategic Plan</p>	NO	0%
2.RG1	<p><b>Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> As necessary, the rules clarify the intentions of the legislation and provide guidance on eligible activities and tasks for the WR/SFR program. The rules specify the roles and responsibilities of the Service and grant recipients in determining the eligibility of</p>	YES	11%

projects proposed for funding from the WR/SFR program.

*Evidence:* 50 CFR Part 80

**Section 2 - Strategic Planning**      Score      11%

**Section 3 - Program Management**

Number	Question	Answer	Score
--------	----------	--------	-------

3.1		YES	6%
-----	--	-----	----

**Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?**

*Explanation:* The WR/SFR program rules require grant recipients to submit annual reports. Grant and fiscal specialists review reports to ensure that funds have not been spent on unapproved purposes. The Division of Federal Assistance (FA) implemented internal policies which includes financial sanctions that reinforce the importance of timely submission of reports. The policies prevent grant recipients from receiving any additional grant funds until reports have been received by FA. Through the Federal Aid Information Management System (FAIMS), FA monitors the submission of reports and enforces the report submission policies. In addition, FA requires States to evaluate techniques for ongoing survey projects every 5 years prior to renewal of the grant in order to determine if surveys being used are reliable and effective tools. FA also reviews State Single Audits to make management decisions, such as determination of high-risk status. Program results are also available to the public through professional journals, magazine articles, and radio and television.

*Evidence:* 50 CFR 80.20, Federal Aid to States in Fish and Wildlife Restoration; 50 CFR 84.12, National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program; 50 CFR 85.12, Clean Vessel Act Grant Program; 50 CFR 86.80-81, Boating Infrastructure Grant Program; Director Memo to States (May 2, 2003); USFWS Overdue Report Tickler for Reports Overdue; Letter to Paul Hamilton, Report Delinquency Notice; USFWS, SERVICE MANUAL, 522 FW 12; Maryland Survey Evaluation; Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, High Risk Notice.

3.2		NO	0%
-----	--	----	----

**Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable**

**for cost, schedule and performance results?**

*Explanation:* Specific performance measures are not included in Service personnel annual performance standards, plans, or evaluations. For partners, several reviews occur during the grant award process that ensures cost effectiveness and feasibility. Specifically, reviews are completed by program and fiscal specialists, as well as the regional Federal Assistance chiefs before a grant is approved for funding. WR/SFR program personnel conduct field reviews to observe progress toward meeting objectives. In addition, all States are being audited by the Department of Interior Office of Inspector General to ensure compliance with applicable rules and corrective actions are taken as appropriate. WR/SFR program rules and internal policy also provide guidance and sanctions to grant recipients for non-compliance.

*Evidence:* Employee Performance Appraisal Plan; FA Trip Report, Trip Report - Connecticut, Monitoring Trip Report -Arkansas; Office of Inspector General Audit Report-Arkansas; Director Memo to States (May 2, 2003).

3.3

**Are funds (Federal and partners") obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?**

YES 6%

*Explanation:* The Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Acts require that the federal grant funds must be obligated within two fiscal years. Any funds remaining unobligated at the end of this time frame are either returned to the program (Sport Fish Restoration) or returned to the Secretary of Interior for use in the carrying out the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (Wildlife Restoration). All grant proposals are reviewed by FA Division staff to ensure they are for eligible purposes based on guidelines of the Acts and program rules. Field reviews and audits are performed to ensure that funds are spent on intended purposes.

*Evidence:* Unobligated funds at the end of two FYs; Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act, Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act; Public Law 105-178, BIG; 50 CFR 84.42, National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program; Office of Inspector General Audit Report-RI; Grant Monitoring Report-Alabama.

3.4

**Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost**

NO 0%

**effectiveness in program execution?**

*Explanation:* The program currently has no efficiency performance measures. The program will develop efficiency measures during the upcoming strategic planning process. Current procedures could help in achieving and measuring efficiencies. In recognition of the need to improve the accountability and address good management practices and business rules, the Federal Aid Information Management System (FAIMS) was implemented in 1998. The FAIMS tracks obligations and expenditures for all grants administered by the Division of Federal Assistance and serves as an interface with other federal financial programs (e.g., HHS). FAIMS incorporates the business rules and provides the platform for a consistent and more efficient reconciliation of the financial management aspects of these programs administration. In addition to financial information, FAIMS is the consolidated source of grant data (e.g., NEPA documentation, processing history, objectives and accomplishments) which can be accessed by the grantee and, in a modified form, the general public. Program rules require grant recipients to use State purchasing guidelines, which includes competitive sources and other appropriate incentives to achieve cost efficiency techniques.

*Evidence:* Federal Assistance Information Management System Exhibit 300; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Automated Grant reconciliation of FAIMS, FFS, & HHS; 43 CFR 12.76.

3.5

**Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?**

YES 6%

*Explanation:* The WR/SFR programs administered by the Division of Federal Assistance (FA) cover most the Fish and Wildlife Service's grant programs (both in number of grant programs and total dollars). Program grants are made exclusively to State fish and wildlife agencies for stated conservation and recreation purposes. Significant communication occurs within the Service for these programs as well as with the States that implement projects to meet the WR/SFR program goals. The Service has recently established the Financial Assistance Coordination Team (FACT) to increase communication between ALL Service grant programs. The FA staff participates in regional Federal Assistance Coordinator meetings, coordinates with the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and publishes a semi-annual FA Program Update. The Service also works with and encourages grant recipients to coordinate their efforts with other federal and state agencies in order to

maximize the program's benefits.

*Evidence:* Financial Assistance Coordination Team Charter; Region 4 Federal Assistance Coordinators Meeting Agenda; USFWS, Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration and Associated Grant Programs, Program Update March 2005.

3.6

**Does the program use strong financial management practices?**

YES

6%

*Explanation:* The program's financial operations were reviewed in FY 2003 as part of a comprehensive Management Control Review (MCR). The MCR concluded that internal controls over financial operations have been strengthened over the past several years and, when tested, were found to accurately record and track the fiscal resources entrusted to the Federal Assistance Program. In FY 2003, the Department reviewed and concurred with the findings of the MCR, thereby removing the material weakness findings in the Program. KPMG, an independent auditor under contract with the DOI Office of Inspector General, conducts annual audits of the Service's financial operations, of which the financial operations of the Federal Assistance Program are included. There are no negative findings by KPMG for the Service's Federal Assistance Program in the FY 2004 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability.

*Evidence:* FY 2003 Management Control Review in Federal Assistance Memorandum; DOI, Performance and Accountability Report 2003; DOI Performance and Accountability Report 2004.

3.7

**Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?**

YES

6%

*Explanation:* The WR/SFR program's financial administration is now among the Service's strongest. This was not the case in late 1990's when deficiencies were identified in 1999 by GAO at the House Committee on Resources, FY1999 Departmental Report on Accountability, and FY2000 Departmental Report on Accountability. The Federal Assistance Division (FA) formed Process Improvement Teams (PITs) to review Federal Aid Information Management System, Financial Reconciliation, Safety Margin, Grant Operations, Audit Review and Resolution, and Organization Function and Staffing, and contracted independent auditor to review. As a result, FA prepared a comprehensive corrective action plan for all issues raised by the external sources and the PITs. Corrective actions were

taken through FY 2003 and reported periodically as part of the Service's Management Control Program. In October 2003, FA's Management Control Review (MCR) found no material weaknesses or major vulnerabilities. In 2003, Department concurred with the MCR stating corrective actions were adequate and material weaknesses corrected.

*Evidence:* Chronology of High Risk Status: The Federal Assistance Program is no Longer a High Risk Program (prepared by Federal Assistance); GAO Testimony: Fish and Wildlife Service, Management and Oversight of the Federal Aid Program Needs Attention; DOI Annual Departmental Report on Accountability 1999; DOI Annual Departmental Report on Accountability 2000; USFWS, Memorandum on Federal Aid Process Improvement Team; USFWS Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures (FY 1999 & 2000); USFWS, Memorandum on Dates for Federal Aid Corrective Measures; USFWS Memorandum on Management Control Review; DOI Performance and Accountability Report 2003.

3.BF1

**Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?**

YES

6%

*Explanation:* WR/SFR programs have oversight practices sufficient to provide knowledge of grantee activities. The oversight practices include: ?? The grant application and reporting system for WR/SFR grants adequately documents the use of funds through the use of the various grant forms that are required (SF424, SF269 and 3-2197a), FAIMS reports and the audit process. ?? Site visits are conducted with the performance of every agency audit. Additionally, the Service's regional offices conduct periodic site visits and file field trip reports on an ongoing basis. ?? The Service is required to and does conduct audits of the State agencies on a five year audit cycle. ?? WR/SFR program tracks expenditures and verifies the funds are used only for designated purpose primarily through the audits of State agencies.

*Evidence:* FWS FORMS, Standard Form 424, Standard Form 269, FWS Form 3-2197a; USFWS, FAIMS Obligation and Payments Report; OIG Audit Report - Arkansas; Intra-Agency Agreement between USFWS & DOI OIG, Audit Agreement.

3.BF2

**Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?**

YES

6%

	<p><i>Explanation:</i> Performance and accomplishment data are collected from grant recipients from their annual project and final project reports. This information is available to the public via several methods. Specifically, accomplishments data are available at the Division of Federal Assistance's iFaims website (<a href="http://faims.fws.gov">http://faims.fws.gov</a>). The public is able to query the Federal Assistance Information Management System (FAIMS) for information on existing grants as well as accomplishments completed in previously closed grants. While FAIMS is the Division of Federal Assistance primary grants management and data collection system, the system's future remains unclear because of pending changes within the Department of Interior as all bureaus will be converting to the FBMS system.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Annual Project Report- Vermont Project W-47-R-11; National accomplishment report from FAIMS (FAIMS Query Reports).</p>	
3.CO1	<p><b>Are grants awarded based on a clear competitive process that includes a qualified assessment of merit?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Competitive grants are awarded based on funding recommendations provided to the Director. Funding recommendations are based on ranking criteria established in the guidelines prepared and issued by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Ranking criteria for competitive grants administered by the WR/SFR program are either published in the Federal Register or in the Code of Federal Regulations. All proposals are reviewed by ranking panels of subject matter experts from the Service and in many cases other agencies. The Service uses multiple methods to notify stakeholders about the requests for proposals and proposal submission procedures for the competitive programs, including in some instances notices to the Federal Register, Grants.gov or letters to the States.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 12/ Thursday, January 18, 2001, § 86.54 How must I submit proposals?; FED Grants, Federal Funding Opportunities, DOI, National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant, Program Notice of Availability of Federal Assistance.</p>	YES 6%
3.CO2	<p><b>Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The Fish and Wildlife Service uses a variety of management practices to monitor grantee activities and ensure that grant funds are being used in accordance within</p>	YES 6%

	<p>the administrative rules and regulations for these programs. These practices include: 1) each State has designated a Federal Aid Coordinator to serve as the liaison with the Fish and Wildlife Service on matters pertaining to these programs (522 FW2); 2) frequent communication is maintained with the State Federal Aid Coordinators; 3) field reviews are conducted of on-going grant projects; 4) annual regional meetings with State Federal Aid Coordinators and other personnel; and, 5) on-going audits of grant recipients are conducted by the Department of Interior Inspector General's office.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> USFWS, Service Manual, 522 FW 2; FA Trip Report, California, Projects Y-8-D and F-115-B; REGION 4 Federal Assistance Coordinators Meeting Agenda; Intra-Agency Agreement Between USFWS &amp; DOI OIG, Audit Agreement.</p>		
3.CO3	<p><b>Does the program collect grantee performance data on an annual basis and make it available to the public in a transparent and meaningful manner?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Performance and accomplishment data are collected from grant recipients from their annual project and final project reports. This information is available to the public via several methods. Specifically, accomplishments reports are available at the Division of Federal Assistance's iFaims website (<a href="http://faims.fws.gov">http://faims.fws.gov</a>). The public is able to query the Federal Assistance Information Management System (FAIMS) for information on existing, open grants as well as accomplishments completed in closed grants. While FAIMS is the Division of Federal Assistance primary grants management and data collection system, the system's future remains unclear because of pending changes within the Department of Interior as all bureaus will be converting to the FBMS system.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> New Jersey Department of Transportation, Office of Maritime Resources, National Boating Infrastructure Grant Program; IFAIMS, National Summary of Accomplishments Report Boating Infrastructure Grants Program.</p>	YES	6%
3.RG1	<p><b>Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The Fish and Wildlife Service publishes proposed regulations for the WR/SFR program in the Federal Register and notifies known stakeholders about the public comment</p>	YES	6%



	<p>period. The Service reviews all comments received during the public comment periods and takes actions as appropriate. For example, the Service reissued program guidance issued initially for the Boating Infrastructure Grant program as a result of public comments.</p> <p>Additionally, the Service has prepared Environmental Impact Statements and Supplements (EIS) for the WR/SRF program whenever it has considered significant changes in the program's management and sought public comments on these documents. Comments were received from 49 State and Federal agencies, 25 non-governmental organizations, 37 members of the general public and over 1,000 individuals from a sportsman's group sent in form letters when the last EIS was submitted for public comments. The public comments received resulted in the Service changing its proposed plan to refocus its management efforts with the WR/SFR program.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> United States Department of Interior. Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program, Fish and Wildlife Service; Boating Infrastructure Grant Program Final Rule, January 18, 2001, 66 FR 5282.</p>	
3.RG2	<p><b>Did the program prepare adequate regulatory impact analyses if required by Executive Order 12866, regulatory flexibility analyses if required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act and SBREFA, and cost-benefit analyses if required under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act; and did those analyses comply with OMB guidelines?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> Program rules for the WR/SFR program are codified in the Code of Federal Regulations. The rules went through all of the necessary and required procedures in place at the time of their codification.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 12/ Thursday, January 18, 2001, 50 CFR Part 84 National Coastal Wetlands Conservation Grant Program, Regulatory Planning and Review; Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 12/ Thursday, January 18, 2001, 50 CFR Part 86 Boating Infrastructure Grant Program, Regulatory Planning and Review; 50 CFR PART 80.</p>	YES 6%
3.RG3	<p><b>Does the program systematically review its current regulations to ensure consistency among all regulations in accomplishing program goals?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The Joint Policy Task Force (JTF) was established in September 2002 to review existing regulations and policies associated with the WR/SFR program in order to</p>	YES 6%

increase the consistency of regulation and policy interpretation and implementation. The scope of the JTF has been increased to include the Landowner Incentive Program. The JTF is comprised of Federal and State personnel associated with the WR/SFR program. The JTF's reviews have resulted in 7 Director's Orders and 2 memos clarifying existing policies.

*Evidence:* FWS Director and IAFWA Memorandum, Amendment to charter of the Joint Federal/State Task Force; FWS Director's Orders 179 and 182.

3.RG4 NO 0%

**Are the regulations designed to achieve program goals, to the extent practicable, by maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activity?**

*Explanation:* Because the WR/SFR program is a long-term established program (portions of the program have existed for almost 70 years), the program's rules were established in 1966 and have been amended seldomly. Minor changes to the program regulations occur on an as needed basis and typically have been required only as a result of changes in the program's acts by Congress. These changes most commonly have resulted after the reauthorization of the Highway Bill, which in recent times has included reauthorization of portions of the revenue sources to the WR/SFR program. When the program does make regulatory changes, the WR/SFR program listens and works closely with its grantee agencies to ensure that any regulatory action is indeed necessary and that the additional burden does not unduly affect the recipients or the intended purpose of the program. The program does not, however, conduct cost-benefit analyses or other analyses to ensure that the program is maximizing the net benefits of its regulatory activities.

*Evidence:* R.J. Essig and R.E. Beal. 2000. Atlantic striped bass recovery: Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration in support of interstate fishery. Fisheries 27(7):17-18; International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, 1997, A Guide to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act; McEachron, L.W. and N.C. Carter, 2000, Texas Gulf coast sport fish program, Special Supplement to Fisheries Volume 25, Number 7, p. 20-21.

**Section 3 - Program Management** Score 82%

**Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability**

Number	Question	Answer	Score
--------	----------	--------	-------

4.1	Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term	NO	0%
-----	---	----	----

**performance goals?**

*Explanation:* The program does not currently have long-term performance measures. The WR/SFR program has made significant progress with reaching many of the conservation activities identified in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement prepared in 1994. The program has been able to continue towards these activity-level targets in large part because of the stability associated with the permanent indefinite appropriation authority. As a result of these activities, the restoration of several fish and wildlife species is attributed to this program, including elk, wild turkey and Atlantic Coast striped bass and the continued recreational use and benefits of these resources. Additionally, the program has significantly increased availability of boating access facilities and infrastructure support for clean waters and shooting ranges.

*Evidence:* United States Department of Interior, 1994, Fish and Wildlife Service- Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program; R.J. Essig and R.E. Beal. 2000. Atlantic striped bass recovery: Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration in support of interstate fishery. Fisheries 27(7):17-18; International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 1997; A Guide to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act; USFWS Federal Assistance Division, 2002, 2001 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-associated Recreation.

4.2

**Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?**

NO 0%

*Explanation:* The program currently lacks annual performance goals that accurately reflect the purpose of the WR/SFR program. Performance measures will be developed during an upcoming strategic planning process. In recent years, the program has met or exceeded most of the programmatic workload activity targets as well as administrative and financial accountability goals which are not considered as performance goals in this section of the PART.

*Evidence:* U.S. Department of Interior. 2003 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability: 2003.

4.3

**Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in**

NO 0%

	<p><b>achieving program goals each year?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The program will develop an efficiency measure during the upcoming strategic planning process for the program. While the lack of an efficiency measure prevents the program from getting a YES for this question under the PART guidance, the program appears to have become more efficient at delivering key services as a result of the Federal Aid Improvement Act of 2000.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2001. Implementation of the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Improvement Act of 2000 and Projected Spending Report; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Automated Grant reconciliation of FAIMS, FFS, &amp; HHS.</p>		
4.4	<p><b>Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> There are other programs that address components of the the WR/SFR program (e.g., North American Wetlands Conservation Act grant program provides grants for wetlands conservation and acquisition); however, there is no single program that is comparable in size and scope. Accordingly, comparisons with other grant programs are not appropriate and would not be adequate. If a comparison were to be made, a conglomeration of many individual programs would have to be constructed (i.e., multiple NGOs) to have a reasonable comparison. An effort of this magnitude and complexity would be inherently too costly and difficult to perform.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> United States Department of Interior.1994.- Fish and Wildlife Service- Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement of the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program; R.J. Essig and R.E. Beal. 2000. Atlantic striped bass recovery: Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration in support of interstate fishery. Fisheries 27(7):17-18; International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 1997; A Guide to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act;</p>	NA	%
4.5	<p><b>Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</b></p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The program has not undergone an evaluation of sufficient scope and quality in</p>	NO	0%

recent years. While independent reviews of components of the program have occurred, key aspects of the program have not been evaluated.

*Evidence:* Federal Consulting Group and American Customer Satisfaction Index. 2005.

American customer satisfaction index: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, Customer Satisfaction Study; Intra Agency Agreement Between USFWS and DOI IG Audit Agreement

4.RG1

**Were programmatic goals (and benefits) achieved at the least incremental societal cost and did the program maximize net benefits?**

YES 20%

*Explanation:* The program rules allow grant recipients maximum flexibility with meeting their individual conservation and recreation needs. The flexibility inherent to these programs has resulted in countless conservation and recreation successes throughout the country for many years.

*Evidence:* US Fish and Wildlife Service Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration, Program Update September 2003

**Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability** Score 20%